

ANIMADVERSIONS

upon a sheet of Mr *BAXTERS*

ENTITLED

An *APPEAL* to the

LIGHT,

Printed 1674.

For the farther Caution of his
Credulous Readers.

*Mat. 10. 26. There is nothing cover'd that shall
not be reveal'd.*

OXFORD,

Printed by H. HALL, 1675.

B

17.8
x 13.7
cm
F4

THE

For the furtherance of the
evangelical cause

Printed and sold by the
author

OXFORD.
Printed by H. Hall, 1875.



I Do not remember I ever saw a Discourse more at variance with its *Inscription*, and so much its Confutation, as This. Let any indifferent Reader Judge what *Light* there is in it: not one Text of Scripture (the best and safest Light) little else but darke *general* and *roving* Reflections throughout, as we shall presently see.

It seems He was accus'd for some Sermon He had Preach'd, and there we have his *Lightsome* vindication. He tells us first that after He had open'd (no less then) 50. *blissings* or *Priviledges* of Believers, He nam'd 20 *counterfeit Priviledges asserted by the Libertines, called Antinomians, Corrupters of the Doctrine of Jesus*. Now may we know who these *Libertines, Antinomians, &c.* be? For, if He mean only such as are usually distinguish'd by those infamous Names, where have They of late apper'd? with what strength and numbers to require so brisk an alarme, as if they were still at our Gates, and ready to climbe our walls? To what purpose is He in such hast, to abase his Pen by setting it to scratch in those Dungbills, where such names have layn buried and putrifying so long? Sure there must be something in it of more *Mystery* then This. Let us try if we can find it out.

First, it were worth our knowing, what *Monsters* they are who *say* (not who meane or spake by consequence, but *say downright*) that *Christ was not only an Ignorant, Infidel, Atheist, a Blasphemer, a murderer, an Adulterer, a Lyar* (I tremble to repeat the words) *but the greatest Sinner in the world, as having the Sins of all the world or Elect made in THEMSELVES His VERT SINS*: and this with great moderation He calls *ill Language* and no more. But 'twere fit we should know whole Language it is (*Antinomians* or others) that we may have them more in Execration, otherwise let any Body Judge at whose doore all this *Blasphemy*

spherny must be lay'd, the very repetition of it in *such odious particularities* without their *Author* sounding little better then a Libel against that Holy ONE The son of God. we know very well who (besides *Libertines, Antinomians, &c.*) affirm truly that all the Sins of Believers are Christs by *Imputation*, and that God caus'd to meet upon Him the *Iniquities of us All*, but not in the vile sense Mr B seems willing to have his Reader believe; we know none such, and if we did, should call it somewhat more then *ill Language*. Nor will it help him a jot to allege that such Blasphemies flow from His *Libertines Principles*, unless some Body would own Them: He is not to take up all the filth He can find in the chanel, for any *Consequence* of His making, to be thrown against our blessed Lord; this is not *Reverence*. And 'tis as farr from LIGHT; for which of his Ordinary Credulous Readers will understand Him otherwise, but that indeed there is a Generation in the world who tremble not to utter such names and characters of Christ; as He out of his Abundance has marshall'd together for Them; and that His *Libertine* and *Antinomian* are but his *stalking-Horses*, not his *Game*, will be more and more discovered; and 'tis but fit; 'tis high time it should.

Ibid.

Ibid.

Next, though He allowes Christ to be a *Mediatour*, yet He denies Him to be a FULL REPRESENTER of our Persons: and why so? Hear Himself speak (and they are no ordinary words) that is, saith He, His *Person* and the *Person* of each sinner were not the same indeed. But first they were the same indeed, *Legally* and *sensu forensi*, though not *naturally*, But his plain meaning is (if his words have any sense at all) Christ and a Believer are not one and the same *Individual natural Person*, therefore He cannot be a FULL Representer. But I would fain know how He should be a *Representer* at all, if He were not another Person. Must He represent Himself: be *Servant, Agent, Delegate* to Himself, (as He varies the Expression?) what ever *Divinity* this be, 'tis certainly new *Law*, and new *Common sense* too. For to *Represent* has ever bin taken in the Judgment of *Mankind* as well as of the *Law*, *Locum alterius*

et numerum obtinere, to stand in anothers stead, and not to be that other Person. But this is the effect of *Hast*, and *wandering* too farr from Home. Mean while He very well knowes (though his poor Ignorant Reader must not) that Christs full Representation has other And much Greater Assertors then *Libertines* and *Antinomians*, who are no *Corrupters* of the Gospel of Jesus, but have done it farr better Service then Himself, and no disparagement to Him.

Again, when He would perswade us, p. 4. that He has only spend a waightry part of Christs Gospel, which Babes should understand, and has only sought to keep us from such Corruptions as look too like another Gospel, and if prevalently practis'd would be mens utter Ruin, 'tis plain I think to any considering Man, that His eye is chiefly upon his *Justification by works* and the Points depending. This is one at least of his waightry Parts of Christs Gospel, to deny which in the prevalent practise would be mens utter Ruin. And are none but *Antinomians* and *Libertines* concern'd in This? what an odd thing is it for a Man when He winks to fancy no Body sees Him! But to be short, and to let all the world see I do Him no injury, may we believe Himself? then Hear Him in his Aphorisms (till his Retractions appear) *Thef. 20. p. 111. To affirm, saith He, that our Evangelical or new Covenant Righteousness is in Christ and not in our selves, or performed by Christ, and not by our selves is such a MONSTROUS peece of ANTINOMIAN Doctrine, &c.* But that All our *Justifying new Covenant Righteousness is extra Nos*, in Christ not in our selves, perform'd by Christ, not by our selves, is the general Affirmation of the Reformed World, its Churches, and Doctors: Therefore These are amongst Mr Baxters *Libertines*, and *Monstrous Antinomians*, *Corrupting the Gospel of Jesus*. The like in a private Letter to his Friend (Mr Ant. Burgess I suppose) some two or three years after. I have not the Book by me, but this He knows to be the sense of his words, that if we grant not his Principles in the Doctrine of Justification, it would be no hard matter to maintain all the dotages of the *Antinomians*, or to that effect.

effect. So now at last I think we have brought Him to the LIGHT indeed. His *Libertines*, *Antinomians*, &c. are whosoever assert against Him the Justification of a Sinner by *Faith, without works*, such as the Church of *England* with the rest of the Reformed Churches. These must be driven by Him with the Herd of *Libertines* as Beasts to the Slaughter. Let any sober man Judge if I wrong Him in the least, nay I durst almost (did not the Thing seem too shamefull to be *confess'd*) appeal unto *Himself*. However if I am mistaken, I shall be heartily glad to know it; but then to convince me, He must bring some better *Light* then shines in His *Appeal*. Pag. 3. He has discover'd a new and wonderful kind of Justification; we must be *Justified*, saies He, by our *Faith* against the charge of *Infidelity*, and by our *Repentance* against the charge of *Impenitency*, by our *Love*, *Holiness* and *Sincerity* against the charge of *Final unholiness*, *rebellion* and being *Hypocrites*. Is not this a pretty sort of *Justification*?

1. Unknown to *S. Paul*, who alone of all the Inspired writers has *ex professo* and so largely treated of this Doctrine. He tells us of no Justification but by *Faith without works*, and from Mr *Baxter* we have a *Particular Justification* for every particular *Grace* than can be nam'd (for we must not suppose Him to exclude any, His reason being the same for all) The Apostle therefore by this Rare Divinity, might have said Being Justified by *Patience*, *Chastity*, *Temperance*, *Frugality*, &c. as well as being Justified by FAITH; nay, He ought to have said so, if He would be Faithful to his Trust, and to the Souls of men.

2. This Justification gives no more to Faith then to any other Consequent Grace; pointblank contrary to *S. Paul*, and to the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches, particularly that of the Church of *England*, as I have elsewhere prov'd as plain as words can do it.

3. If we are Justified by Faith only from *Infidelity*, and from every other Sin respectively by its opposite Grace and vertue, how shall we understand Him who is THE TRUTH when He

He tells us so often to this effect, *He that BELIEVETH shall be Sav'd* ? and what means *S. Paul* to assure us that *being Justified by Faith we have peace with God* ? For if *Faith* Justify us only against the charge of *Infidelity*, and every other Grace be requir'd to Justify us against its opposite Sin, then it cannot be true (at least universally as the words are intended) that *He who believeth shall be sav'd, and have peace with God*, no more then that a *Felon* shall be acquitted at the *Assizes* and freed from fear, who is found *not guilty* of one *Inditement*, and has twenty more to plead to. We are sent to no garment to cover our Iniquities from the Eye of Divine Justice but the Robe of *Christs Righteousness put on by Faith alone*, a Robe without *seams or patch*; no *Linsy-wolsy stuff* admitted there.

But the Defence He makes for Himself against a *City-Report* is very considerable, and as clear as *midnight*. He tells us how it was reported; that *He should say the Difference between us and Papists was but in words*. I hope He would not do so; but what saies He to it, for now it concerns Him to speake? Why truly as to the Business against his *Libertines, Antinomians, S. Paul*, and the *Reformed Churches* in the point of *Justification*, wherein His *Appeal* seems chiefly if not solely concern'd, I can find nothing but a general *Complement* to his Reporters, an Information how dear He has bought his knowledge, a *Prophecy* that He may shortly *Dy*, with an Information of *Preferments offer'd*. This in effect is All to the Defence He makes to a Charge of that moment. Let every one be satisfied by his own eyes.

Only He complains that some *Distinctions* and *Instances* of His were left out in the Report. Now observe how He Courts the LIGHT, to which He appeals. Let any man read the beginning of his 4th Section, where indeed He distinguishes between *Popish Points*, some of meer *Interest*, and some arising from the *Difficulty of the matter* and the *weakness of human understanding*: of the former He gives us also some *Instances*, as the *Papal power, Indulgences, Purgatory, &c.* Of the latter

latter not one that is either *usually* or properly call'd *Popish*, but such as are canvass'd by the *Remonstrants* and their Antagonists, as well as the Jesuits; and so *smooths* off the business, and All is well. But not a word all this while of his *Libertine-Points*, Justification by Faith, &c. Not the least direction where we shall bestow these, whether amongst the *Interest* or the *Difficulty-matters*. No, no; *There is a Time for All Things*. This is Mr **Baxters** APPEAL to the LIGHT. And whereas He concludes with this bold Perswasion that *few Ministers of Christ in England will prove so weak as to propagate what He condemns, and call's Errors*, 'tis an immodest Bravado, highly injurious to the Vertues and Learning of the MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, as if They were generally in such a Readiness to forsake the Banner of their own Church, with All Her Renowned Captains, to fight under the Colours of a single Mr **BAXTER**.

F I N I S.

Courteous Reader,

By some unfortunate mistake in my Absence, my Answer to Mr Baxters Quotations for his new Original Sin, have wholly escap'd the Press. It should have enter'd pag. 20. after lin. 14. which therefore I am necessitated to peerce here at the end, and referr all to your favourable Construction.

From pag. 12. to. 21. I find you very busie in smoothing your way (where none can easily stumble) to prove some Interest of children in their wicked Progenitors Sins: a thing never question'd by me, nor by any man else (I think) who owes the Authoritie of the *second Commandment*; so that I am not the man you combate (though your Credulous Readers must upon your word beleive the contrarie) Alls but the shadow of your Fancie, and the Itch of your Pen to fall upon me. I charge you with a new *Secondarie Original Sin*, whose pedigree is not from Adam: I engage not a syllable farther.

And now let us advance to your Proofs, and observe the issue. *Tertullian* leads your Van; but neither He, nor any of the Rest, strike one stroke in your Cause. I cannot in Reason expect that He should so much as use the word *Original*, when applyed to Sin: for (If I mistake not) it came not in on that account till about *Austin's* time, in his famous warrs with the *Pelagian*. However, if we can find the Thing, this *Secondary Original Sin*, all's well enough, I am for no meer *Logomachies*. All that can be forc'd from that Quotation, must lye in the single clause of [*Quamquam si Evangelium veritatis accipias, &c.*] which in English sounds thus, *Although if you own the Truth of the Gospel, you will find to whom appertains the sentence of visiting the Iniquities of the Fathers upon the children, namely to Them who were to bring this Doom upon themselves; His blood be upon us, and upon our children.*

Now This is very farr from curing any *Admiration* of mine

Page 21. mine (as you seem to promise me) save that of giving your-
 selfe the Trouble to quote Him so little to the purpose. For
 He proves nothing in contest between Us; no more then
 This, that God upon that execrable Imprecation most justly
 requir'd the Sins of the Bloody Parents at the Hands also
 of their children; who have generally approv'd that wick-
 edness unto this day. You will have a knotty peece of work
 to hew out another Original Sin from any such Testimonies

Page 23. as these. Next comes the Martyr *Cyprian*, who discoursing
 the mischief which children are subject to from *ill education*,
 and especially from the bad *Example* of their *Parents*, ag-
 gravates the matter in a *Rhetorical* Protopopœia, where He
 brings in the poor children with this sad complaint, *we have*
found our Parents our Murtherers; They have denyed for Us
the Church our Mother, and God our Father, &c. He speaks
 there of the *Lapsi*, who out of Fear offer'd unto *Idols*, and
 by their Example taught their Children to doe the like, and
 so were instrumental to their Guilt and calamity. It must
 be some *Delian Diver* can fetch out your *new* Original Sin
 from hence; for the old and *only* one came in at another
 door then that of *Pelagian Example*; and besides we should
 make as many *Original Sins*, yea as many *Fathers*, as we
 have prevailing Examples in the world, which I know you
 will not grant.

Page 23, 24. p. 24. is the same *verbatim* with *S. Anstius*, where you quote
 His *Enchiridion*. But however that happen'd (both living in
 the same Century) tis no barr to Him as another witness; if we
 have any Evidence for You. The greatest force of that
 Consort-Testimony lyes I thinke in the close, where it speaks
 thus, *quia & in illo uno quod in omnes Homines pertransiit,*
 &c. that is, *because in that ONE Sin which passed upon All*
men, (and which was so great, that it changed the nature of
man into a necessity of Dying.) there are many Sins to be found,
with other Sins of Parents, which though they cannot alter
Nature, yet involve and bind the children in the Guilt, unless
 she

the Free grace and mercy of God relieve them. Those Holy Fathers are there interpreting that passage Psal. 51. 4. *Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother bring me forth.* Which they think fit to render with the Vulgar, *In iniquitatibus, in peccatis*, and thence inferre that David has respect unto some other Sins wherein Children may be involv'd besides that of the first and common Father.

But besides that They suggest an Answer to the Inference, when they tell us of many Sins in that ONE Original, it appears they either had not consulted, or were not skill'd in the Hebrew (which S. Austin somewhere confutes of Himself, nor was the want of that convenience any way scandalous in that Age, though *Jeroms* industrie had rescued Him from it) For in the Original, all runs in the singular number *unus* and *unum*, so that nothing can be concluded thence, But take what those Pious Fathers say *De bene esse*, and as we find it, they will do you no service, seeing all their Evidence amounts to no more then This generally Confessed Truth, that God if He pleases may reckon with wicked children for their wicked Parents (as well as their own Personal) Sins. This will not rise up to a new Original Sin, which those venerable Doctors sufficiently distinguish from the Sins of nearer Progenitors, when of these they tell you, *non possunt mutare naturam*, i. e. they can worke no change upon Nature, as the true and only Original Sin has done to such a sad degree. And whereas you tax Bellarmine's accomodation for a *shift* and a *meer violence*, when He interprets them to mean of the punishment, and not of the fault, upon this ground that there can be no punishment without a Fault, I wish you had consider'd it better. For allowing your Proposition in *Se*, that Punishment supposes a fault, it follows not that the contagion of the Parents Personal Faults are deriv'd unto their children, seeing they have Sin enough of their own for which at any time they are responsible to the Sovereign Justice of God. And when that Justice is pleas'd to visit the iniquity of the Fathers upon the children, 'tis indeed the wicked Fathers de-

Pag. 27.

served punishment, but not their Posterities (*catenu*), and upon that account) save only when they tread in the same forbidden Paths Themselves, and then every one will pronounce them inexcusable.

Page 25. After *Leo* comes *Gregorie the Great*, who indeed seems at first view to favour you more than any of the Rest, especially in that one clause, *dum pro culpa parentis Ex originali Peccato anima polluitur Prelis*, i. e. for the fault of the Parent the Soul of his Child is polluted by Original Sin. But 1. here is no mention of any Original Sin but one, no Secondary Originals:

2. He saies not, the soul of the child is polluted by any personal actual sin of the Parent, but *ex Originali peccato*, from Original Sin, from that one (in the singular number) we All derive from Adam: I can make no more of it, and that's nothing to your purpose; for *ex culpâ Parentis* is there interpreted to be Original Sin, of which every Father as well as Adam is guilty, and so derives His own Original Sin as well as Adams to his Children; Here is nothing of any personal actual Sin to be rationally inferr'd, as you would have it.

Page 25. For *S. Austin* (whom you place after *Gregory*; though almost 200 years before Him) you told me in another place I knew not *He was of your Judgment*. No more I do to this day: He has nothing of your new Original Sin; of any more Originals *in specie* then one. Only He moves a question, whether Children be not guilty of all their Progenitours both Actual and Individual Original Sins transmitted successively from Adam: and in the upshot leaves it undetermin'd, with a *non immerito disceptari potest*, (it may justly be disputed) & *temere affirmare non audeo* (I dare not, saies He, affirm any thing) Call you this his Judgment for you, where He pronounces nothing, and tells you He dares not define? A pregnant evidence indeed, that speaks not one positive syllable in your Cause! But this is to be in *Haste*.

You

You tell us you would trouble your self and the Reader with more of the Ancients words, if you thought it worth the Cost. But truly I think you have given sufficient trouble to both already, and ought upon that account to pay both Costs and Damgages to your Reader. Pag. 27.

Now for your *Gul. Parisiensis*, whom *Trisphemus* I grant adorns with the Title of *Eruditus in Scripturis*, a man well vers'd in the Scriptures (let every one believe of that as much as He pleases) what shall we say to Him, who tells us in one chapter that Original Sin is a *Pest*, & *Scaturigo vitiorum*, & *Seminarium*, the source and seminary of all vices; and in the very next denyes it to be either *culpa*, or *aliquid culpabile* i. e. to be a fault, or to have any thing faulty in it? an absurdity, which *Bellarmino* Himselfe has sufficiently refuted, *De statu Pecc. L. 4. c. 3.* 'Tis plain however from the front of his 5. ch. *ibid.* that his concerne there is only in the Cause of Original Sin, and how it is transmitted, where He appeals to *Galen* and his Disciples, and determines it to be convey'd by a *Seminal* infection, with which neither you nor I have any thing to do, as to our present particular contest. For let it be convey'd this way or the other, I am not now concern'd, 'tis still *Original Sin*, and still but one, and so this Quotation is of no waight at all: Let the soul of man if you please be *extraduce*, by generation as well as his Body (for which you so earnestly contend) it will never contribute any thing to your new Original Sin, except you can show us some either *habitual* or *Actual* Vices; which are not root'd in the OLD; and when you have done that, we will add it to the wonders of the world. Your own *Parisiensis* with his *Scaturigo & seminarium*, will never allow of This.

But now we come out of the thick darkness of *Parisensis* his Age into the light of the Reformed writers. Of whom good *P. Martyr* makes the Foreman of the Jury. And what saies that worthy Person? why, the utmost I can find is this, that Sin pollutes both Soul and Body, and that some infection of the Soul may be deriv'd from the *seminal* contagion. Pag. 28.

gion of the Body; whereupon He advises the Parents to a Holy life, *ne & animas / nos & corpora pollutant &c.* lest they pollute both their Souls and Bodies, and consequently infect both in their children; which at the highest He never understood but of bad seminal *Dispositions*, which every one knows can necessarily effect nothing, and so He tells you a little after, *notandum hoc esse contingens, non necessarium.* But good Sr you might have minded that in your very Quotation, He denyes all Sins of neerer Progenitors to be of the same kind and nature with *Original Sin*, and proves it too, and consequently is point blanke against you; which if you heeded no better, lookes like an *Oversight*, and if you knew it, you deale not fairly with your English Reader, by hiding it from Him.

Pag. 29, 30.

Pag. 31.

You injure *Walau* (and so abuse your Reader) when you make Him reprove *Corvinus*, without taking notice of any of his *explanations*, for asserting with the *Pelagians* that the Imputation of Adams Sin and that of our neerer Progenitors is *alius plane rationis*, of no kindred or likeness at all. Whence you would infer the parity or resemblance (at least) of your new *Original Sin* with the *Old* one, as if the difference were little or none. But pray Sr tell me, did you transcribe from others, or read it your self in *Walau*, what you quote out of his 9. chaptr. p. 263, 264? Did you read both those Pages (not to mention the 268th)? If you did not, we have no cause to commend your *diligence*; if you did, we wish better proofes of your *sincerity*. For there He interprets his meaning (of no alliance with yours) in as plain words as a Schollar would desire. *Corvinus* denyes the Imputation of Adams Sin to be *true and Real* and asserts it to be only *dispensative* (as He tells you there) to *make way for the Covenant of Grace*, as if God were not *angry in earnest* with mankind for that *Original Sin &c.* but grants the Imputation of neerer Progenitors Sins to be indeed *true and proper*. *Walau* blames Him justly for the former, in making no Body knowes what of the Imputation of Adams Sin (which is no part of our

Wal. p. 264.

our

our present controversie) so that in effect He speaks in all your Quotation no more then This, that the Sin of Adam was really and properly imputed to his Posterity, not only by *Corvinus* his imaginary Dispensation. Whereas you no doubt would have your Reader believe, that *Walans* holds the Imputation of Adams Sin and our neerer Parents to be in the main *eiusdem rationis*, of the same kind and Genius, which as to the Reality of Imputation we grant they are, but not as to any thing else you aim at : so that I suppose you have enough of your *Walans*.

Neither does *Ursin* speak a word for you, but in the close of that Quotation, *against* you (so farr as I have any thing to do with you) He tells us indeed that *non foret absurdum* &c. There would be *no absurdity*, if God for the multiplyed Sins of Progenitors should make the burden of Them heavier upon their children, and thats All; and who ever questiond this? no more is to be fish'd out of Mr *Gatakers* words, nor thing to a new *Original Sin*.

Pag. 31.

May me thinks you have something like a forc'd offer to a *Recantation*, p. 33. where telling us of your *abundance of Protestant Writers* on your side, and generally all the *Expositors on the second Commandment*, all I can find you would make of them is (in your own words) *that Temporal Judgments and some spiritual are oft inflicted by God on children for their Fathers Sins*. And have you not now brought all to a doughty conclusion, in which you have none to oppose you? may not you sit down and *plume* your selfe over your incomparable performance, and the *route* you have given me?

But however all this shall not hinder me from an Act of Charity to you: For seeing you seem not at all to understand your own Question, nor to know well how to set about your worke, give me leave (though unworthy) to hint you a few *directions* how to manage this unwieldy business you have undertaken. You may use or reject them as you please, tis at worst but a little good Counsel lost.

Sr,

So, if you are for a *new Secondary* Original Sin, I conceive (with your pardon) you have these three great works to do.

1. To prove (what you have asserted) that this Novel Original Sin is not deriv'd from our Original Father, no line of Communication between them; a Sin *besides that which is deriv'd from Adam*, as you *plainly* and *positively* affirm. For if indeed it derive in a direct Line from the *first* Transgression, and have its whole Root fastned there, to talke of a *new Secondary* Original Sin, is not in my Judgment the best sense that may be spoken.

* Pag. 25. 2. To make good against *Austin* (* in your own Quotation) that your new Original does *mutare naturam*, change the Nature of Man, as the *Old* one does to our Cost and sorrow.

* Pag. 30. 3. You have also to prove against *Peter Martyr* (and in the words you have * cited too) that the derivation of Progenitors Sins (be what they will) to their children is constant and necessary, not uncertain, or Contingent. When you have prov'd the first, and baffled your own witnesses in the other two, I care not if I promise you to be your Profelyte: but till then I much feare that all you can say will be but *Trifling* and *Impertinence*.

The words that should have followed are these, p. 20. I have now done with that part of your Preface, &c.

